

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JOSHUA NEIL HARRELL,

Defendant and Appellant.

A155884

(Solano County
Super. Ct. No. FCR329394)

Defendant Joshua Neil Harrell appeals an order revoking and then reinstating him on post-release community supervision, with a modification of his conditions to include 180 days in county jail. Defendant's appointed counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record. We have conducted an independent review of the record and find no arguable issues. Accordingly, we shall affirm the order.

Background

On June 6, 2018, a petition for revocation of defendant's supervision was filed alleging that defendant had possessed methamphetamine and refused to submit to drug testing. At the revocation hearing, a probation officer testified that the terms of defendant's supervision require that he abstain from the use of drugs and submit to drug testing. A courthouse security officer with the Solano County Sheriff's Department testified that defendant was detained at the security screening while attempting to enter the courthouse. After defendant set off a metal detector three times, the officer conducted a pat search, felt something in defendant's clothing and removed a small gold container from defendant's pocket. A usable amount of methamphetamine was found in the

container. Defendant claimed he had recently found the container and did not know what was inside. Thereafter, defendant refused to submit to a drug test. He agreed to take the test only after the officer had disposed of the unused test.

The trial court found defendant in violation of the terms of his supervision. The court revoked and reinstated defendant on supervision on the same terms with the additional condition that he serve 180 days in county jail. Defendant was awarded credit for 86 days served.

Discussion

Substantial evidence supports the finding that defendant violated the terms of his supervision. The court did not abuse its discretion in revoking and reinstating defendant on supervision with the additional condition. Defendant was adequately represented by counsel throughout the proceedings on the petition to revoke.

After filing his *Wende* brief, appellate counsel notified defendant of his right to request that counsel be relieved and of his right to file his own brief within 30 days. In response, defendant has filed a letter requesting that appellate counsel be relieved and new counsel appointed. Defendant's letter fails to specify any grounds for replacement. Based on our examination of the record, we discern no failure of appellate counsel to effectively represent defendant, as no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Accordingly, defendant's request for appointment of new counsel is denied.

Defendant has not personally filed a supplemental brief.

Disposition

The order is affirmed.

POLLAK, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

TUCHER, J.
BROWN, J.